

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Support for the amendment can be found *e.g.* on page 14, lines 5-17. Editorial revisions have also been made to claim 41. Applicants thank Examiner for allowing claims 9-45 and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Ross et al.* (US 6,608,628, hereinafter "*Ross*"). Applicants traverse the rejection in view of the amendment above and the following remarks.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a method for providing electronic delivery of electronic model images. The method includes generating one or more electronic model images and storing the electronic model images within computer readable memory of a server-based computing system. The method further includes delivering the electronic model images to a remote client computer and manipulating the electronic model images upon the remote client computer. However, the electronic model images stored on the server-based computing system remain unchanged when the electronic model images distributed to the client computer are manipulated.

In contrast, *Ross* discloses a method for virtual interactive medical imaging by multiple remotely-located users. The system in *Ross* includes a Virtual Collaborative Clinic (hereinafter "VCC") component which enables users to interact in real-time with the same data set. See, *e.g.*, col. 11, lines 20-25. The collaboration is accomplished by linking together attributes of the image on each computer so that a change to an attribute on one computer is immediately propagated to all of the other participants' computers. See col. 11, lines 58-68. One of the major advantages touted by *Ross* is the ability to affect the image on all computers by manipulating the image on one computer.

Ross does not disclose or suggest the ability to manipulate an object such as an electronic model on a client computer without affecting the electronic model stored on the server-based computing system. This separation between the model stored on the server computer and the model distributed to the client computer is important. One example use for these electronic models is to store a record of the patient's dentition prior to treatment. See, *e.g.*, page 10, line 19 to page 11, line 5. These records should remain unchanged throughout the treatment. The

invention of claim 1 enables a user to manipulate and analyze a copy of the electronic model on the client computer without erasing or corrupting the electronic model saved on the server computer.

For at least these reasons, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Ross* does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6 is requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Applicants note that a portion of the Office Action appeared to reject claim 7 in view of *Ross*. See, e.g., page 2 of the Office Action. However, claim 7 was indicated as objected to, but otherwise allowable, in other portions of the Office Action. See page 2 of the Office Action and the Office Action Summary. Claim 7 was also not discussed with regard to *Ross*. Applicants, therefore, assume that the inclusion of claim 7 in the rejection of claims 1-6 is a typographical error. Clarification is requested if the Applicants' assumption is incorrect.


The Examiner indicated that claims 7 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In view of the amendments to claim 1 above, Applicants believe that claims 7 and 8 are now also in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: September 8, 2005



Brian H. Batzli
Reg. No. 32,960
BHB/JKS/jt